



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,262	06/26/2002	Adeyinka Adedeji	08CN8824-4	1237
23413	7590	10/28/2003		EXAMINER
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002				SZEKELY, PETER A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/064,262	ADEDEJI ET AL.
	Examiner Peter Szekely	Art Unit 1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>9/15</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnell et al. 5,294,654 or General electric EP 0 124 916, in view of Hellstern-Burnell et al. 5,294,654.
2. Burnell et al. disclose PPE in claim 1, phosphates in claim 4 and tapered block copolymers in column 8, lines 20-26. Concentrations are shown in column 9, lines 45-49. Since the fillers are optional additives, when they are not there, they cannot interfere with the transparency. Polystyrene-maleic anhydride copolymers and PPE are both clear polymers as it can be seen in Maeda et I. 5,095,049, in claim 2, Laing 5,213,860, in claims 4 and 12, Bott et al. 5,319,027, in Example 25, Bouma et al. 5,585,242, in column 7, lines 59-65 and Kostrzewski et al. in the paragraph overlapping columns 2 and 3 and column 3, lines 30-32, while the Finaclear block copolymers, which applicants are using too are well known of their clarity as shown in the Finaclear literature submitted by applicants. General Electric teaches PPE, block copolymer and phosphates in claim 1, and tapered block copolymers on page 4, line 18. Fillers and zinc compounds are show only as optional typical additives. Hellstern-Burnell et al. recite PPE having a weight average molecular weight of 20,000-80,000 (column 3, lines 27-29), which PPE is used with phosphates and styrenic resins (claim 1). The transparency is inherent in the compositions. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to leave out the opacifying optional components of Burnell et al. and General Electric from their compounds if a

transparent article were desired. It also would have been obvious to the same artisan, to use the PPE of Hellstern-Burnell, since that molecular weight range has been used customarily in phosphate containing PPE-styrenic resin blends. Applicants' submission of a Declaration proving insufficient transparency in the unfilled compositions of the cited primary references would obviate this rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (703) 308-2460. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Peter Szekely
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

P.S.
10/23/03